

Meeting Minutes
Mercury Citizen Advisory Committee
November 16, 2001
Lowell Center, Room B1B
Madison WI

Facilitator: Bert Stitt

Members Attending: Mark Yeager, Environmentally Concerned Citizens of Lakeland Areas; Eric Uram, Sierra Club; Steve Hiniker, Citizens Utility Board; Keith Reopelle, Wisconsin Environmental Decade; Russ Ruland, Muskellunge Club of Wisconsin; Annabeth Reitter, Wisconsin Paper Council; Jeff Schoepke, Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce; Bill McClenahan, Forest County Potawatomi Community; Kathleen Standen, Wisconsin Electric; Joe Shefchek, Alliant Energy; Wayne Stroessner, Random Lake Association; John Coleman, Great Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Commission; and Ed Newman, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation (alternate for Bill Skewes, Wisconsin Utility Association)

Others Attending: Mark Looze, Wisconsin Environmental Decade; Meggin McNamara, Michael, Best & Friedrich; Harold Frank, Dairyland Power Cooperative; Ed Wilusz, Wisconsin Paper Council; and Lloyd Eagan, Jon Heinrich, Tom Karman, Jenny Pelej and Anne Bogar, DNR

Welcome

Lloyd Eagan welcomed the Committee.

Check-In

Bert Stitt conducted a check-in with Committee members asking that they say how they were and identify their expectation for today's meeting. Members were ready to work and two additional agenda items were requested.

Minutes of October 1 Meeting

The Committee approved the minutes of the October 1, 2001 meeting. Several Committee members requested that more detail be included in the minutes when the Committee gets to discussing issues about the proposed rule.

Agenda Review

The Committee agreed to add two items to the agenda which were brought up by members. The first was to conduct a round on support for three general statements presented by John Coleman. The second item was requested by Mark Yeager to conduct a round on whether the Committee membership reflected a citizen committee or a stakeholders committee and whether the name should be changed.

Secretary's Parameters

Lloyd shared a memorandum from Secretary Bazzell that outlined his parameters on product expectations, timeframe and process. The Committee discussed the timeframe proposed and agreed that no one wanted an open-ended timeframe and all agreed that they "could live with" an outside target of March 2002 and an inside target of February 2002 for completing the Committee's work.

Basic Agreement

The Committee had an extended discussion on the wording of three statements in a proposed basic agreement brought up by John Coleman. The language the Committee used to conduct the rounds was as follows:

- 1) Methyl mercury levels in the food chain deriving from fish are a health problem;
- 2) Reducing mercury emissions from the major air sources including power plants can contribute to the solution; and
- 3) We can do something.

Bert conducted a round on each item, asking members if they could support the statements. Each statement was supported by a majority of members however, on each statement concerns were expressed that the issues were more complex than what was stated and dissents were heard.

Name Change

Committee member Mark Yeager stated that the Committee appeared to be more of a “stakeholders” committee than a “citizens” committee and asked to hear what other Committee members thought and whether they thought a name change was appropriate. After some discussion, Bert conducted a round of Committee members. Most members thought it was more of a stakeholders committee while others thought it was both. However, there was not a strong sentiment to change the Committee’s name.

Unresolved Issues

The Committee revisited the issue of using caucuses for Committee work and agreed to include caucusing as an option for Committee work at its meetings.

Public Comment Summary

Jon Heinrich presented the summary table of public comments and noted that it is a way to see the range of comments that came in. He noted that staff is working on a more complete summary in the format used for the Natural Resources Board, which will include a summary of each comment and a response from the Department. He answered a couple of Committee member’s questions, clarifying that the formal rule comment period is closed and that a summary of citizen comments is also available.

Technical Advisory Group Update

Tom Karman presented information (see handout from meeting) on the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) charge and goals, a list of TAG members, an outline of the process for information development by the TAG and questions from the TAG for the Committee. He noted that the TAG has gone through a process to identify major issues and prioritize them (results included in handout) and is in the process of preparing issue briefs. Issue briefs are currently being prepared on baseline determination, environmental assessment, emission credits, compliance, control

technology, the federal MACT rule, multi-pollutant alternatives, emission monitoring and variance provisions.

Bert led Committee members through an exercise of writing questions for the TAG on sticky notes and organizing them into general categories. Tom will draft responses to the questions and get input from the TAG on the responses and bring them back to the Committee at its next meeting.

Schedule Future Meetings

After discussing how many meetings the Committee should have and whether they need to meet face to face, the Committee agreed to meet once before the end of the year and to bring 2002 calendars to that meeting. The next meeting will be on Wednesday, December 12, 2001 from 9:30-1:30.

Content of Committee Report

The Committee went through an exercise to identify priorities on the list of issues they identified at their first meeting. Members were first asked if there were any issues missing. Several clarifications were made to the issues identified. Members were then asked to put one red dot on the posted flipchart sheets to identify the issue they thought would most likely delay the process. Members were next given 12 blue dots to identify issues they thought had the highest priority (a limited number of votes was allowed under 4 categories of issues). There was significant agreement on the priority for several issues and the Committee thought the exercise was a useful one.

Closing

Members set a new ground rule that they try not to add new agenda items at the meeting and if they are added, they will be taken up at the end of the agenda if there's time.

Closing comments varied but most members felt the end of the Committee meeting with the priority-setting exercise went well and hoped that meetings would be more productive in the future.